

REMARKS

Claims 1- 36 were presented for examination and were pending in this application.

Claims 1-36 were rejected in the outstanding Office Action. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Claims 12 and 30 were objected to in the outstanding Office Action. Applicants are amending claims 12 and 30 for clarity and in response to Examiner's objection. Applicants submit that amendments to the claims do not narrow the scope of coverage to which Applicants believe they are entitled. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments adequately address Examiner's objections, and ask that Examiner withdraw them.

Examiner commented that the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed 7/25/2001 was non-compliant. Applicants respectfully ask Examiner to please clarify or point out the particular deficiencies in the IDS, particularly in light of the fact that Examiner has initialed all but one of the references. This information will allow Applicants to address Examiner's concerns in the next correspondence.

Turning to Examiner's substantive rejections, independent claim 1 has been amended to include "wherein the step of modulating comprises encoding a low-speed data channel according to a Reed-Solomon code and interleaving the encoded low-speed data channel," and independent claim 12 has been amended to recite "wherein the step of demodulating comprises reversing a Reed-Solomon encoding on a low-speed data channel and de-interleaving the low-speed data channel." Similarly, independent claim 21 has been amended to include "wherein the modulator comprises a Reed-Solomon encoder for encoding a low-speed data channel according to a Reed-Solomon code and an interleaver for interleaving a digital string output by the Reed-Solomon

encoder,” and independent claim 30 has been amended to recite “wherein the demodulator comprises a Reed-Solomon decoder for reversing a Reed-Solomon encoding and a de-interleaver for reversing an interleaving process.” Support for these amendments may be found at, inter alia, pages 24 and 27 and Figures 6A and 6B of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that these claims, as amended, and the remainder of the claims which depend on them, are patentable over the cited references. Examiner admits that the primary reference, Yamoto, does not disclose modulating each low-speed data channel to generate a corresponding low-speed symbol channel. (Office Action, ¶6) Examiner asserts that Shibagaki teaches modulating the low-speed signals to obtain a low-speed channel located on a particular carrier frequency. (Id.) However, the claims as amended specifically elaborate upon a particular way of modulating that comprises, in the case of claim 1, the particular elements of “encoding a low-speed data channel according to a Reed-Solomon code and interleaving the encoded low-speed data channel.” Applicants’ representative has examined both references in their entirety and have found no suggestion, disclosure, or hint of either of these elements. In fact, word searches for the terms “Reed-Solomon,” “interleave,” and “interleaving” through both references yields no hits.

As such, even assuming *arguendo* that Examiner is correct, neither of the references, alone or in combination with the other reference, discloses or suggests the invention as per the amended claims. Examiner’s arguments are moot in light of the current claim amendments, and their entry is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application in a manner consistent with the Patent Office Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000). In making these amendments, Applicants have not and do not narrow the scope of the protection to which

Applicants consider the claimed invention to be entitled and do not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID A. PECHNER et al.

Date: _____

By: 

Colleen V. Chien
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 55,062
Fenwick & West LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: (415) 875-2319
Fax: (415) 281-1350